

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE  
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

CITY OF KENNEWICK,

Petitioner,

v.

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD,

Respondent.  
.....

DOCKET NO. TR-040664

ORDER NO. 05

PREPARED TESTIMONY OF  
ROBERT R. HAMMOND

CITY OF KENNEWICK,

Petitioner,

v.

PORT OF BENTON and TRI-CITY &  
OLYMPIA RAILROAD,

Respondent.

DOCKET NO. TR-050967

ORDER NO. 01

PREPARED TESTIMONY OF  
ROBERT R. HAMMOND

**INTRODUCTION**

**1. Please state your full name and job title.**

Robert R. Hammond, Kennewick City Manager.

**2. Please describe your prior positions you have held with the City.**

From July, 1989 until December, 2000, I was the Maintenance and Operations Manager in the Public Works Department, responsible for primarily water/sewer division operations, street maintenance and large water/sewer construction projects. In this position, I reported

1 to the Public Works Director. From December, 2000 until September, 2003, I was the  
2 Public Works Director, responsible for the policy oversight of the Public Works  
3 Department, reporting to the City Manager. I was named Kennewick City Manager in  
4 September, 2003 and remain in that position at present.

5 **3. In a chronological fashion, can you generally describe your involvement and**  
6 **job title in the decision-making process to extend Columbia Center Parkway?**

7 Through December, 2000: Maintenance & Operations Mgr – Public Works Dept –  
8 input limited to water/sewer issues.

9 From December, 2000 through September, 2003: Public Works Director –  
10 Recommended policy to Council through City Manager regarding the scoping, funding,  
11 major project design (e.g., decision regarding how to proceed with relocation of Mail by  
12 the Mall business), public involvement and interagency relations related to the project.

13 From September, 2003 to present: City Manager – primarily involved with major  
14 project decisions that involve complex interaction with other agencies and the primary  
15 communications line to City Council.

16 **4. Please describe the benefits to the City of Kennewick of this project?**

17 The primary benefit is in relieving present and future traffic congestion from Columbia  
18 Center Boulevard, now running over 40,000 vehicles per day. This will allow better  
19 accessibility to Kennewick retail businesses and result in improving the economic strength  
20 and vitality of this area of the City.

21 **5. Can you contrast your role on this project as Public Works Director versus**  
22 **City Manager?**

23 As Public Works Director, I acted mostly to review and approve solutions to technical and  
24 public involvement issues versus City Manager where I act mostly in policy issues  
25

1 involving other agencies and am the focal point of communications with Kennewick City  
2 Council.

3 **6. Can you identify the people on your staff who participated in the analysis**  
4 **that led to the decision to extend Columbia Center Parkway?**

5 Ken Nelson (finance);

6 Dan Kaufman (engineering);

7 Peter Beaudry (traffic planning, analysis and engineering).

8 **7. Can you explain how this project will be funded?**

9 Primarily through Rural Economic Vitality (REV) grant funding administered by the  
10 Washington State Community Economic Revitalization Board (CERB) with matching  
11 funds from City of Kennewick and City of Richland. We also anticipate small amounts of  
12 private and partner agency funding.

13 **8. Are there any constraints on how the funds must be used? If so, please**  
14 **explain.**

15 Conditions are typical of federal and state funding for transportation projects and are as  
16 set forth by the Federal Aid Project Prospectus and Local Agency Agreement, both of  
17 which were approved for execution by City Council on March 6, 2001.

18 **9. Are there any time parameters for which the funds must be used?**

19 I know of no set deadline for expenditure of the grant funds; however, CERB has the  
20 ultimate decision authority regarding the continuance of the REV grant funding and has  
21 set precedence by withdrawing funds for other state projects that have not moved forward  
22 in a time-frame acceptable to CERB.

23 **10. Can you identify any consultants retained by the City to assist in the**  
24 **evaluation of the project whether it be for technical or economic**  
25 **development purposes?**

1 SCM Consultant, Inc.

2 HDR Engineering, Inc.

3 **11. Can you describe the extent of consideration given to an above or below**  
4 **grade crossing?**

5 City staff and SCM had general discussion regarding separating grade of the vehicular and  
6 pedestrian from rail traffic. It was readily apparent, based upon experience with other such  
7 projects, that a grade separation component in itself would cost multiple times the entire  
8 project budget and was therefore not economically feasible.

9 **12. Was any cost analysis given for one of these options?**

10 No.

11 **DECLARATION**

12  
13 I, Robert R. Hammond, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the  
14 State of Washington that the foregoing PREPARED TESTIMONY OF ROBERT R.  
15 HAMMOND is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

16 DATED this 19<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2006.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

  
ROBERT R. HAMMOND